

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of May 8, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

The Abstract is objected to because it comprises two paragraphs. The Abstract has been rewritten in proper form.

Claims 5, 6, 10 and 11-16 are objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 (c). These claims have been amended to correct the multiple dependencies.

Claims 4 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 4 and 10 have been canceled thus the rejection is moot.

Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 7 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/763,384. Claim 7 has been amended to recite the limitation of claim 8. Claim 8 was not included in this rejection; hence the rejection is moot.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Todd (U.S. Patent No. 4,844,324).

Todd does not disclose a method for corrective soldering in response to a visual inspection of the soldered joints by means of video camera. The video camera 60 (figure 1) of Todd is used for aligning leads 26 and terminals 20 in order to connect these two (see column 7, lines 31-48). Thus Todd does not teach each and every element of the instant claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,600).

Kobayashi discloses a device and method for automatically corrective soldering of joints which have been assessed by a video camera (see the description of the second embodiment - figures 10-13).

Claims 1 and 7, as amended, recite that the corrective soldering is carried out with a selective soldering apparatus. "Selective soldering" is "soldering only at positions at which an actual soldered joint is to be made." See the description on page 4, lines 2-3, and page 6, lines 14-18 of the present application. See Dutch patent application 1017843 (cited in specification and corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 6,655,574) for an example of a selective soldering device.

Kobayashi does not teach a selective soldering device. Thus Kobayashi does not teach each and every element of the instant claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan A. Wolffe
Reg. No. 33,568

Date: August 8, 2005

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
(202) 508-9100